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## SKFTA Bad – Economy

### SKFTA hurts the economy

[Robert Oak](http://www.economicpopulist.org/users/robert-oak), 7/08/10, “South Korea Free Trade Agreement Will Cause 159,000 Americans to Lose Their Jobs”,

http://www.economicpopulist.org/content/south-korea-free-trade-agreement-will-cause-159000-americans-lose-their-jobs

Economist Robert E. Scott has cranked the numbers on U.S. job losses if the South Korean Free Trade Agreement is passed. Yet another bad trade deal would cause [159,000 Americans](http://www.epi.org/economic_snapshots/entry/free_trade_agreement_with_korea_will_cost_u.s._jobs/) to lose their jobs sover 7 years. EPI’s research show it will increase the U.S. trade deficit with Korea by about $16.7 billion, and displace about 159,000 American jobs within the first seven years after it takes effect. Scott also calls out the USITC, our trade so called representative and commission for denying, routinely, the American job losses of these agreements. From the research paper overview: This Economic Policy Institute analysis examines the likely jobs impact of signing pending FTAs with Korea and Colombia. It shows, based on past experience,that these trade agreements will increase the U.S.’s trade deficit with both countries. Contrary to the Chamber’s projections, the EPI analysis then shows that the increased trade deficit per se will correspond to the loss of 214,000 jobs in the U.S. by 2015. What is it about trade deficit these people do not understand? If one reads Dr. Scott's work, the assumptions and calculations are thorough. Shame our government isn't

### SKFTA kills the economy

Ensinger 2010. Dustin, Economy in Crisis, http://www.economyincrisis.org/content/south-korea-ftas-impacts-us“South Korea FTA’s Impacts on U.S.,”

Despite claims to the contrary by the U.S. International Trade Commission, the proposed South Korean free trade agreement will result in steep job losses domestically as well as a significant increase in the trade deficit, according to the Economic Policy Institute. The USITC has forecast that the proposed free trade agreement would have a small positive impact on the American trade deficit while having a “minimal to negligible impact on U.S. employment.” But, as Robert Scott of the EPI points out, the USITC has had a rather abysmal record predicting the impact of free trade agreements on the U.S. In 1999, the group predicted that China’s entry into the World Trade Organization would result in a $1 billion increase in the trade deficit and have very little effect on American employment. Seven years after China’s ascension into the WTO, the U.S. trade deficit had increased by $185 billion and resulted in the loss of 2.4 million American jobs. Once again, it appears that the USITC is underestimating the potential impact of a free trade agreement. According to the EPI’s estimates, in the first seven years of the agreement, it could cost as many as 159,000 American jobs and increase the trade deficit by $16.7 billion. With unemployment hovering around the 10 percent mark, the EPI is not the only party concerned about the impact the South Korean free trade agreement could have on American jobs. Some Congressional Democrats have vowed to fight against the agreement. "To try and advance the Korean FTA when so many workers are still struggling to find work would simply move our economy backward," Rep. Louise Slaughter, a New York Democrat, told AFP. Democrats and unions have steadfastly opposed the South Korea deal on the grounds that Seoul officials have not sufficiently opened their automotive market up to American exports. In 2007, the U.S. sold 7,000 American vehicles in South Korea, or less than one percent of the entire market. South Korean automakers, on the other hand, sold 615,000 vehicles in the U.S. that same year, according to Pat Choate's book Saving Capitalism. The president’s insistence to forge ahead with a trade pact negotiated under the Bush administration and almost universally loathed in his own party has baffled some, who say it is a betrayal of his campaign promises on trade. Leo Hindery, Chairman of the New America Foundation, writing in the Huffington Post, points out that then-candidate Obama took an entirely different position on free trade on the campaign trail. "Change is ending tax breaks for companies that ship jobs overseas and giving them to companies that create good paying jobs here in America; it's putting people to work...making the materials we need to rebuild America; it's...creating millions of new jobs - jobs that we want to be good union jobs - and giving our workers the skills to do them," he said in a speech to the United Steelworkers Union in 2008. Now the president is ready to abandon that pledge and sign a free trade agreement that will almost certainly ship American jobs overseas, sap American wages and further erode the nation’s once-proud manufacturing base.

## SKFTA Bad – China War

### SKFTA destroys US-Taiwan relations

Stevenson, 2010, KORUS: Good for South Korea, but Who Else? December 13, [Ian], p.

p. http://blogcritics.org/politics/article/korus-good-for-south-korea-but/page-2/

KORUS is already being seen by other Asian trading partners as giving an unfair advantage to S. Korea. [The Taiwan Ministry of Economic Affairs](http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/biz/archives/2010/12/07/2003490278) has come out against the pact, feeling that Taiwanese exports to the U.S. will be squeezed out by similar products from S. Korea. Others, including China, will undoubtedly condemn this agreement, as failing to give all competitors a level playing-field.

### That risks China-Taiwan war

Lohman & Chambers 2010, Heritage Foundation and US-Taiwan Business Council, , October 6, [Walter; Ruppert-Hammond], p. http://www.us-taiwan.org/reports/2010\_october06\_lohman\_hammondchambers\_editorial.pdf

The Obama administration seems to consider the calm an opportunity to focus on the more pressing foreign policy problems in East Asia, the Middle East and elsewhere. A lack of initiative from Washington has left U.S.-Taiwan relations essentially on autopilot. It's a convenient response — but extremely shortsighted. The key to long-term stability — across the Strait and throughout the Asia Pacific — is a strong, free, prosperous and democratic Taiwan able to hold its own in its dealings with China. This is possible only in the context of a healthy, action-oriented U.S.-Taiwan relationship. And this time of relatively peace and stability across the Strait is the perfect time to achieve it.

### China will escalate the conflict – perception of rational escalation ensures US gets drawn into the nuclear arms race

Glaser, PolSci Prof at George Washington, ’11 (Charles, March/April, “Will China’s Rise Lead to War?” Foreign Affairs, Vol 90 Issue 2, EbscoHost)

ACCOMMODATION ON TAIWAN? THE PROSPECTS for avoiding intense military competition and war may be good, but growth in China's power may nevertheless require some changes in U.S. foreign policy that Washington will find disagreeable--particularly regarding Taiwan. Although it lost control of Taiwan during the Chinese Civil War more than six decades ago, China still considers Taiwan to be part of its homeland, and unification remains a key political goal for Beijing. China has made clear that it will use force if Taiwan declares independence, and much of China's conventional military buildup has been dedicated to increasing its ability to coerce Taiwan and reducing the United States' ability to intervene. Because China places such high value on Taiwan and because the United States and China--whatever they might formally agree to--have such different attitudes regarding the legitimacy of the status quo, the issue poses special dangers and challenges for the U.S.-Chinese relationship, placing it in a different category than Japan or South Korea. A crisis over Taiwan could fairly easily escalate to nuclear war, because each step along the way might well seem rational to the actors involved. Current U.S. policy is designed to reduce the probability that Taiwan will declare independence and to make clear that the United States will not come to Taiwan's aid if it does. Nevertheless, the United States would find itself under pressure to protect Taiwan against any sort of attack, no matter how it originated. Given the different interests and perceptions of the various parties and the limited control Washington has over Taipei's behavior, a crisis could unfold in which the United States found itself following events rather than leading them. Such dangers have been around for decades, but ongoing improvements in China's military capabilities may make Beijing more willing to escalate a Taiwan crisis. In addition to its improved conventional capabilities, China is modernizing its nuclear forces to increase their ability to survive and retaliate following a large-scale U.S. attack. Standard deterrence theory holds that Washington's current ability to destroy most or all of China's nuclear force enhances its bargaining position. China's nuclear modernization might remove that check on Chinese action, leading Beijing to behave more boldly in future crises than it has in past ones. A U.S. attempt to preserve its ability to defend Taiwan, meanwhile, could fuel a conventional and nuclear arms race. Enhancements to U.S. offensive targeting capabilities and strategic ballistic missile defenses might be interpreted by China as a signal of malign U.S. motives, leading to further Chinese military efforts and a general poisoning of U.S.-Chinese relations.

## SKFTA Bad – South Korea Economy

### SKFTA kills South Korea’s family farms

Kim 2007, Thomas executive director of the Korea Policy Institute “The Second Opening of Korea: US South Korea Free Trade Agreement,” <http://www.kpolicy.org/documents/policy/070614thomaskimsecondopening.html>

The South Korean agricultural sector is not export-oriented but instead strives to be self-sufficient in rice, horticultural products, and livestock production. Except for rice that works under a quota system, South Korea places a substantial tariff on agricultural products in order to protect these industries. Nevertheless, South Korea already imports about 60 to 0 percent of its agricultural products, and this percentage is certain to rise under the proposed FTA. South Korea currently has roughly 3.5 million farmers, or about 7.5 percent of the population. All farming in South Korea is done by individual farmers with small- to medium-size holdings, and the average American farm is 58 times larger than the average Korean farm. Like small family farmers in the United States, South Korea's farmers cannot compete with large U.S. agribusiness capable of producing low-priced goods with the aid of significant U.S. government subsidies that will continue whether or not the FTA passes. Agricultural provisions in the new KORUS-FTA is likely to obliterate this indigenous base of family farmers, with at least half of Korea's farmers expected to lose their farms. Those who can will enter urban areas in search of work, but half of South Korean farmers are now over 60 years old. Because we are not talking about simply about dollars and cents and won, but rather, about South Korean concerns over the preservation of its cultural and familial heritage (and for some South Koreans, their sovereignty as a food-secure nation), the rise of American agribusiness and the concomitant decline of South Korean family farmers are likely to result in intensified anti-Americanism not only in the agricultural sector, but through various sympathetic sectors within civil society. The sense of cultural loss and anti-Americanism is likely to be exacerbated by the recognition that the demise of South Korean family farms will come not at the hands of other family farmers, but rather by the entry of subsidized U.S. agribusiness.

### That’s Key to the South Korean economy

Ajl 2010 Max, Solve Climate News,. “Return to Small Farms Could Help Alleviate Social and Environmental Crises,” http://solveclimatenews.com/news/20100110/return-small-farms-could-help-alleviate-social-and-environmental-crises?page=2

So it makes sense to try to think of creative, non-coercive ways of encouraging such people to move back to the countryside. At the very least, they’d be able to contribute meaningfully to the broader economy, as well as to their country’s economic development more generally — small family farms provided the impetus for South Korean and Japanese economic development, by creating a backbone of rural demand to provide markets for urban production. Furthermore, as Annie Shattuck and Eric Holt-Giménez note, Walter Goldschmidt’s classic study of agriculture in California’s San Joaquin Valley in the 1940s compared areas dominated by large corporate farms to areas still dominated by smallholder farmers. In towns surrounded by family farms, the wealth generated in agriculture circulated among local businesses. There were more local enterprises, paved streets and sidewalks, parks, churches, clubs, newspapers, schools, higher overall employment and more vibrant community life. "In communities near large, mechanized farms, small towns died off."

## A2: SKFTA Solves Korea War

### SKFTA can’t solve Korean war

Kim and Lee 2009 Sung Eun, Research Fellow at the Asiatic Research Institute and MA in Poli Sci from Korea University Dong Sun, Ph.D. Political Science, University of Chicago The Impact of a Free Trade Agreement on the U.S.-South Korean Alliance: A Theoretical and Empirical Assessment, 20. Annual Convention of the International Studies Association

This article critically evaluates the prevalent view that a free trade agreement (FTA) between Seoul and Washington would markedly strengthen their security alliance. For that purpose, we examine the impact of economic ties on U.S. alliances with Australia, Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines, as well as South Korea, over the past quarter-century, while drawing relevant insights from the theoretical literature on international commerce and alliance cohesion. The research finds that the conventional wisdom has questionable theoretical and empirical foundations. There are several logical reasons for rejecting the prevalent view. First, the FTA would not markedly increase mutual dependence between the U.S. and Korean economies. Second, expanding economic ties with potential adversaries such as North Korea and China may cancel out any marginal alliance-enhancing effect of the agreement. Third, the FTA could adversely affect the vested interests of influential societal actors, which might blame their economic losses on the alliance and turn against it. Fourth, the alliance could become more asymmetrical and further lose its public appeal. Also, the empirical analysis shows no clear positive association between the level of economic interdependence and the strength of alliance